

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

A. THE CLAIMS

Claims 28 and claims 30-47 remain in this application.

Applicant appreciates the opportunity to discuss the claims and the references with the examiner on December 13, 2005.

B. CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C § 103

Examined claims 28-32, 40, 41 and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,738,362 to Xu et al. (hereinafter, "Xu '362") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,539,482 to Blanco et al. (hereinafter, "Blanco '482"). Claims 33-37 and 43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu '362 in further view of Blanco '482, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,780 to Liu, et al (hereinafter, "Liu '780"). Claims 38, 39, 45, 46 and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu '362 in further view of Blanco '482, in further view of Liu '780, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,628 to Xu et al. (herinafter, Xu '628).

Xu '362 is directed to dividing the functionality of a home agent in a mobile network into two components – a registration agent and a tunneling agent. The goal of Xu '362 is to make such networks more scalable. The Xu '362 invention contemplates distributing the home agent functionality across multiple devices, with one device devoted to handling the registration and authentication functions, and another device devoted to the routing and tunneling functions of a home agent. Xu '362 identifies that the former functions, i.e., registration and authentication, are not particularly computationally intensive, and that a single general purpose computing device can handle a very large number of simultaneous registration and authentication transactions without any undue latency, management, or other problems, either alone or in concert with a RADIUS or Authorization, Authentication, and Accounting (AAA) server.

Blanco '482 is directed to reducing the number of passwords required to access a

directory on a network. Rather than use a password to connect to the network and a password to connect to the directory, Blanco teaches a conversion process that uses the directory password (LDAP) for both purposes.

The present invention is directed to allowing remote access to legacy systems by determining from the access data what kind of authentication a home service provider requires. Claim 38 of the present invention recites the limitation, "determining from the home region identifying information whether the home region supports Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) authentication." The examiner found this limitation in Blanco. However, Blanco does not require a determination to be made as to the home region and does not describe a decision being made based on the home region of the user. Blanco does not make a decision because a decision is not required. The Blanco client-server relationships establish a path that is unique for each type of authentication request supported by the system. Blanco relies on a conversion process to permit differing access protocols to interact with a universal authentication database. The present invention, by contrast, utilizes existing databases to handle access protocols by directing an access request to a database that process a request in a particular protocol and does not require either a conversion process or a universal authentication database.

Because the cited references do not teach all of the limitations of claim 28 (as amended), Applicant submits that claims 28 (as amended) and the claims 30-39 that depend from claim 28 (as amended) are not obvious over the cited prior art and are, therefore, allowable in their current form.

The examiner also rejected independent claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu '362 in view of Blanco '482. Independent claim 40 (as amended) recites the limitations, "determine from the home region identifying information whether the home service region supports Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) authentication," and "receive user identifying information and home region identifying information from the user computer." As previously discussed, these claim limitations are not taught or described by the cited references. Because the cited references do not teach all of the limitations of claim 40 (as amended), Applicant submits that claims 40 (as amended) and the claims 41-47 that depend from claim 40 (as amended) are not obvious over the cited prior art and are, therefore allowable in

Appl. No. 09/731,571
Reply Dated December 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 8, 2005

Express Mailing Label No.:
EV 589980526 US

their current form.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the current rejection. In view of the responses and remarks made above, Applicant further requests issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance in this case. Should any further questions arise concerning this application or in the event the above amendments do not place the application in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone interview. Please contact Jon Roberts at the number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

By 

Jon L. Roberts, Esq.
Registration No. 31,293
Elliott D. Light, Esq.
Registration No. 51,948
Roberts Abokhair & Mardula, LLC
11800 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 1000
Reston, VA 20191
703-391-2900